1	APPEARANCES: (Continued)	
2	For International Paper:	FOLEY & LARDNER 777 West Wisconsin Avenue
3	ι άρει .	Milwaukee, Wisconson 53202 BY: MR. JAMES T. McKEOWN
4	For Norampac	K&L GATES LLP
5	and Cascades:	70 West Madison Street Suite 3100
6		Chicago Illinois 60602 BY: MR. SCOTT M. MENDEL
7	For Weyerhaeuser	McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY
8	Company:	227 West Monroe Street Suite 4400
9		Chicago Illinois 60606 BY: MS. JENNIFER A. SMULIN DIVER
10		QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN
11	101 0001 g10 1 0011 10 1201	51 Madison Avenue New York, New York 10010
12		BY: MR. MARC L. GREENWALD and
13		FIGLIULO & SILVERMAN Ten South LaSalle Street
14		Suite 3600 Chicago, Illinois 60603
15		BY: MR. JAMES R. FIGLIULO
16	For Temple-Inland, Inc.:	MAYER BROWN LLP 71 South Wacker Drive
17		Chicago, Illinois 60606 BY: MS. BRITT M. MILLER
18	For RockTenn CP, LLC:	WINSTON & STRAWN
19	,	35 West Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60601
20		BY: MR. R. MARK McCAREINS
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

called you in. I want to thank all of you for having come in for this status hearing. As you might guess, it was of course occasioned by the lengthy opinion that was issued by Nan Nolan, which I think was her last major project before -- to the regret of my colleagues and myself -- things led to her deciding to retire from our Court.

Don't misunderstand that expression of regret.

Mary Rowland, who is right over here and whom I would introduce to you en masse, is going to be taking over not only as Nan's successor but she, I can assure you, is extraordinarily able. All of us on our Court joined in deciding for her to be our -- one of our two newest

Magistrate Judges. I asked her to join us today, not only so you could meet her but also I know that you will find working with her is going to be presenting a smooth transition.

I should add, by the way, that Nan's clerk has joined Mary so that -- and I know that all of you know that clerk is familiar as well.

Now, with that said, why don't you all sit down so I can talk to you? And then we will hear whatever else may be presented.

I am not sure how many of you have been involved in other cases on my calendar. There are a lot of familiar faces here, but over the years I would think that people have become no doubt aware that the handling of this case is

uniquely different from my otherwise universal practice. Each of us on our District Court has a different kind of approach, a different manner of handling his or her own calendar management. I often say that we are sort of like separate solar systems, separate solar systems not only in those terms but also because we never get the privilege of observing what our colleagues do, so we don't learn from our colleagues, regrettably.

Now that set a variance in this instance that extends to the way in which we involve our first-rate cadre of Magistrate Judges. Some of my colleagues, in a pattern that goes back at least as far as Pren Marshall, when Pren adopted a practice of both early and comprehensive referral to Magistrate Judges basically for health reasons, as chance would have it. But he found that very appropriate, and that means sort of a automatic turnover of the entire supervision of the preparation of discovery and all corollary matters.

And I know a lot of my colleagues do that as well. I shouldn't say "a lot." I really don't know how many do for the reason I just mentioned, but I can tell you that by contrast I operate essentially on a hands-on basis. So what I do is conduct regular status hearings, keeping track of the discovery process, deciding discovery disputes myself, except for a small matter -- small number of matters -- when I think that, all things considered, it could be better to refer the

matter to a Magistrate Judge.

\_ .

But from the very beginning, after I dealt with the initial motion that sought to trash the then group of complaints that have merged into one, my sense was that this one, both the nature and scope of the action, called for the much closer and continuous exercise of oversight than I could provide at all while I was managing my inventory, let me put it that way.

As you probably know, I was the first judge on our Court to have opted, when I took senior status, to maintain and continue to maintain a full calendar, both civil and criminal. Old habits die hard. I suddenly realized I had been doing that for 20 years. But you know life is great when it passes quickly when you are having fun, you know.

As you may or may not be aware of this, I think that our Court publishes averages. So I won't tell you the secret about what my calendar consists of, but the average is somewhere in the upper two-hundreds. It is lower than it was when I first joined the Court, but it is close to 300 I think in terms of average, and that is on the civil side. And of course each of us has somewhere in the range of 35 to 40 criminal cases on our calendars.

Well, as you know, to return to our case,

Magistrate Judge Nolan performed what in a non-chauvinistic

sense I will refer to as yeo-person service -- that is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

distinct from veoman service -- calling the disputed issues as she saw them, and I think also substantially resolving a good many disputed issues so that they are no longer disputed.

Now I have certainly read and reviewed carefully her memorandum opinion and order. And I am of course not going to deal with it at this point. As you know I just received motions from defendants, a big box of papers and then Mike Freed's most recent submission of a redacted version just for my information that challenged a lot of aspects of the report.

But in doing that and reading through the thing I was struck, among other things, by something I spotted here down at the bottom of Page 37 which says -- this was in connection with Nan's treatment of backup tapes. She said, "There is no discovery cutoff date in this case and plaintiffs are only 20 percent complete with their first level review of defendants' documents."

Can I hear from both sides' counsel as to whether that is really a fair prognosis or what?

MR. FREED: Michael Freed for the plaintiffs, your Honor. While we don't have the exact figures because it is a constantly moving --

> THE COURT: I know.

MR. FREED: -- volume of documents, it is pretty

accurate. And while I think the suggestion may be that it is smaller than you might have expected at this point, but we think that there has been about eight or nine million pages of documents. And we have been reviewing them assiduously.

THE COURT: I am not -- don't misunderstand, I am not asking this from a critical point of view. It is just kind -- it is really a factual inquiry.

> MR. FREED: Well, it --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So what you are saying is that that sounds about right.

It does, your Honor. We actually MR. FREED: discussed it. Mr. Wozniak from our firm has been keeping tabs the best he can. But there are three or four phases of the document review. First they have to get loaded. Then they have to be analyzed. Then reviewed.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FREED: So we think in terms of actual production and actual review that is about right at this point.

THE COURT: Do defendants have a similar handle on the thing? Does that sound something like --

MR. EIMER: Your Honor, Nate Eimer. I am not sure. We don't know where the plaintiffs are in reviewing their documents. We would have hoped they would have been much further along at this point, and we would have hoped that

there would be a discovery cutoff date as well at this point.

But I think that is correct, we are where we are.

realistic.

\_ :

THE COURT: Well, let me ask both sides for your

thoughts on a different subject. As experience has told us
-- and I go back now to the period when I was in practice as

well as since I have been on the Court -- most cases such as

this ultimately end up getting settled rather than tried.

Most not all. I think that years ago Thurman Arnold wrote a book in which he likened the process to the mating dance of birds on the South Sea Islands, in which he said everybody knows where you are going to end up, but you have got to go

through the motions anyway. And that -- I think that is

So it sounds to me as though what we are -- even though there is always a good deal of bloodletting on both sides that precedes that, what we are talking about is that either in terms of trial or in terms of the potential for settlement in which a judge might play a meaningful part, that we are talking about several years. Is that fair on both sides?

That I think I can ask both sides. You don't know where they are, but you know not only what you provided, but you also know what is being sought of you in terms of further matters on several aspects as which the Magistrate Judge said no. Is that right?

MR. FREED: That is exactly it. In our view that is exactly right, your Honor. We also discussed that and that was our best estimate, was two years for the whole process to play out.

MR. EIMER: Yeah, I am not sure I disagree with the process either. They obviously need more time to review the documents. They have to digest them. And we are going to have an extensive deposition program, I assume. And so I can't imagine it is less than 18 months. My guess is it would be something closer to the two years Mr. Freed talked about.

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.

Well, as you might guess, those are things to which I have given a good deal of thought in terms of what certainly remains to be done beyond the Magistrate Judge's opinion, including in the first instance need for a judicial ruling on the objections to the motion. Now all of you who practice regularly in this District know that, as I said, I am the first senior judge to have stuck with a full civil and criminal calendar. And I don't contemplate changing that so long as I certainly remain capable of doing it, nor do I contemplate emulating some of my former colleagues who, out of justifiable resentment of the Congressional intransigence that forces all of us to continue to maintain our vows of poverty -- voluntarily, I guess -- you know, a lot of us have

-- and I say that in relation even to the youngsters who are in the practice, not like you people. And so I don't contemplate any change in that.

But with that said, I think that -- and I have come to believe that it is obvious from the expected answers that I had anticipated and that you have given to me, that there is no realistic prospect that I am going to see this one to the end of the case either way, that is, settlement or -- or trial.

And certainly what would I think be inappropriate would be for me to be making interlocutory rulings that a judge who will ultimately see the case to the end could and should take a fresh look at. Whenever we get cases, you know, by reassignment, the first responsibility of the Court, although there is a lot of language that says, well, you stay with the thing unless you find some important reason not to, the point is that each us who is responsible I think has an absolute obligation to make sure that you agree with whatever has gone before.

So it strikes me, having seen what Nan did, that this is both an obvious and quite appropriate watershed for consideration of her opinion, and the objections moving forward from there seems to me to call for a change of judge. Magistrate Judge Rowland has, as I told you, retained the same law clerk who is familiar with the case and to you, and

so a new District Judge is not going to be, as I think of it, less well-equipped than I to engage in the ultimate oversight.

So with regret, because I don't do this very often, I am going to exercise the prerogative that senior judges have under Section 294(b) to withdraw from the case and transmit files and save some file space to whatever new judge is going to end up with the case.

Now I have said my -- I have said my say. I am not sure that it calls for anything on the part of -- on the part of counsel be -- first because you can't compel me to do otherwise, but more importantly because I think it is fair to say that the legal issues that I have dealt with in connection with the case -- which some new judge, by the way, might disagree with -- but the legal issues that I have dealt with are not that dense as a thicket so that a new judge is going to be handicapped to any extent at all. Because basically you have been living with the Magistrate Judge all this time frame, it does not seem to me that judicial economy is particularly to be served by retention.

So unless somebody has something to say other than good-bye, I am not sure that there is any particular comment that is called for. But I wanted all of you to understand the reasons for my decision, which frankly I had not anticipated until I received this very thorough 40-page

1 opinion that gave me a good handle on where the lawsuit 2 stood. 3 So anyway, that is my take. So you will be getting 4 an order. It gets -- goes up to the Executive Committee, 5 gets reassigned at random. I wish all of you good luck. I 6 also wish particular good luck to my successor. And then you will be in a position -- I am of course I am transmitting, 7 apart from everything else, my files, the motion, and I would 8 9 leave it to the new judge also to set the schedule for 10 response to the objections. 11 Now the way that is going to work is that -- Sandy, 12 how -- it should take only a day, right, two days? 13 All right. So what I would suggest is that you 14 call whenever you get the information as to the new judge, 15 call the judge's chambers, see about setting the thing up 16 basically on a motion call simply for purposes of 17 establishing a schedule, which is the next step. Okay? 18 Thank you all. Thank you. Thank you. 19 MR. FREED: Your Honor, from the plaintiffs I'd 20 just like to tell you it has been a pleasure to appear before 21 you. We are sorry that you won't be handling the case, but 22 we appreciate all you have done. 23 THE COURT: Well, kind words will get you noplace, 24 you know.

MR. FREED: I am not trying to get any place

25

because you are not going to continue. 1 2 THE COURT: Like when I used to practice law and I 3 got nice comments from clients, my standard response was that 4 "Kind words are harder to come by in the practice than fees, 5 so they are more welcome when they do come." But yes. 6 MR. EIMER: Your Honor, let me add mine as well. 7 As your Honor knows, I have been in front of you longer than 8 you have been on senior status. 9 THE COURT: I know. 10 I won't even go back and say how long, MR. EIMER: 11 but I appreciate being in front of you always and will be 12 disappointed not to be here. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you all. 14 (Which were all the proceedings heard.) 15 CERTIFICATE 16 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 17 from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 18 19 s/Rosemary Scarpelli/ Date: October 17, 2012 20 21 22 23 24 25